

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DANIEL VANDERKODDE, et al.,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	No. 1:17-cv-203
-v-	)	
	)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
MARY JANE M. ELLIOTT, P.C., et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF**

Defendant Mary Jane E. Elliott P.C. requests leave to file a supplemental brief discussing newly-issued authority. (ECF No. 91.) Plaintiffs do not oppose the motion, on the condition that they too can file a supplemental brief addressing the newly-issued authority.<sup>1</sup> (ECF No. 95.)

The motion for leave (ECF No. 91) is **DENIED**. The opinion the parties would like to address is one this Court recently issued. In fact, the two cases have a defendant in common. The Court does not need additional briefing to decide this matter. Being fully apprised of the facts, the law, and the outcome in the other case, the parties proposed briefs do not offer new insight. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: May 21, 2018

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> The Local Rules requires a party filing a non-dispositive motion to determine whether the motion will be opposed, and also requires the party to file a separate certificate setting forth the attempts to comply with the rule. Defendant did not file any such certificate.